The Sun.

SUNDAY, NOVEMBER 25, 1906.

Entered at the Post Office at New York as Second Class Mail Matter.

Subscriptions by Mail, Postpaid.

DAILY, Per Month	$0 50
DAILY, Per Year	6 00
SUNDAY, Per Year	2 00
DAILY AND SUNDAY, Per Year	8 00
DAILY AND SUNDAY, Per Month	70

Postage to foreign countries added.

Published by The Sun Printing and Publishing Association at 170 Nassau street, in the Borough of Manhattan, New York.

If our friends who favor us with manuscripts for publication wish to have rejected articles returned they must in all cases send stamps for that purpose.

Mr. Roosevelt and the Tariff.

There has been of late some vague discussion of the President's more intimate attitude toward the question of revising the Dingley schedules. The most interesting opinion developed was that which imputed to Mr. ROOSEVELT a determination to effect a thorough revision of the tariff during the remainder of his term of office and to do it upon a plan characteristically and peculiarly his own.

The President thinks that all tariff revision which contemplates a general and comprehensive schedule is criminal folly. The mere announcement of an intention to deal with the subject produces incipient commercial paralysis. It upsets all stability in business and entails wholly unnecessary and even destructive penalties. Uncertainty is the deadliest enemy of trade.

President ROOSEVELT is credited with the belief that if certain items or elementary groups in the schedules are taken and dealt with singly, and with the distinct provision at the outset that the revision shall become operative only after a reasonable period has been allowed to the industry or trade which is affected by the change in which to adjust itself to the new conditions, a sensible and satisfactory reform can be instituted without any of the business disturbance and dislocation which the whole country so justly dreads. We must say that this project, if a project it be, impresses us as being founded in the most wholesome common sense.

It is conceivable that Mr. ROOSEVELT has the influence and the power to restrict the undue activities of the Congress by the firm and effective stipulation that any measure which exceeds a certain well defined scope will receive his veto. In this way it would be possible to deal rationally, chapter by chapter, with the whole subject, and produce neither alarm nor disturbance. Once an industry or a trade is aware that the tariff under which it operates is to be reduced, but that time is to be allowed for the maturing of existing contracts and the consumption of material on hand, that industry or trade is relieved of all uncertainty and apprehension and can not only view the proposed change calmly, but can cooperate to produce the best results.

We should look upon such a move on Mr. ROOSEVELT'S part with the warmest approval, and we believe that feeling would be shared by every important interest in the country. A change in the existing tariff is inevitable. The all important thing is how it shall be effected. If as heretofore, then five years of wretched and wholly gratuitous trouble, anxiety and misfortune. If by a new party coming into power and inspired by the kind of doctrines that have clothed the winds of late years, then more years of worse misery and tenfold misfortune.

It seems more than possible that the President could bring such a reform about if he addressed himself to it. Unless he does so there will be no such reform until there is a change of Government. The whole force of initiative rests with the President. The Republican party is absolutely incapable of initiative, and if Mr. ROOSEVELT once started on the proposition he would have the whole country behind him as even he has not yet had it.

May we hope that the agitation which ascribes this beneficent activity to the President does not err? If it is true, it implies that the next two years will be fraught with the greatest blessings that could be conferred upon this people.

Two Estimates by High Authority.

Yesterday Secretary ROOT was reported as saying at Cincinnati that the Panama Canal "would be built in ten years."

Yesterday in the *Century Magazine* for December there appeared a very interesting article on the Panama Canal by Secretary TAFT, in which he says: "The time required for the construction of the lock canal is about eight years."

There is not necessarily any conflict between the estimates of these eminent authorities. Perhaps Mr. TAFT reckons his eight years from the present time, while Mr. ROOT'S ten years begin in 1904, when work was actually inaugurated under American control.

In that case Mr. ROOT'S ten years and Mr. TAFT'S eight years would end alike in the year 1914, not a year too soon for the needs of the world's commerce in peace or this republic's safety in case of war.

Same Old Story From Peary.

Mr. PEARY, on his way home from the polar regions, is preceded by the usual vanguard of scandal and recrimination. It seems to be an inevitable concomitant of such Arctic explorations that the world must be shocked and grieved by tales of needless suffering and accusations of criminal neglect and lolly. Although they are invariably begun in an ostentation of confidence that "this time" the mistakes of the past have been thoroughly forestalled, they as invariably end in failure after a repetition of nearly every blunder that has crowded chronicle with tragedy.

On the occasion of PEARY'S last departure we were assured that he had at last succeeded in collecting the ideal equipment for his task. He had been furnished with every agency he asked for. His preparations covered every conceivable emergency and contemplated every possible vicissitude. Experience had done its perfect work. For the first time in his adventurous career he had been provided with a vessel exactly suited to the purpose. He had fitted it, down to the minutest detail, with an enlightened knowledge, an almost superhuman prevision. He had everything he wanted—everything which the liveliest imagination, informed by prayerful thought and the most prolonged personal observation, could suggest. And if the material aspect of the expedition was flawless, as he averred it was, it remained to say only that the personnel was at all points worthy of it. And so on. He had the perfect machinery of exploration, and, more than any living man, he knew exactly how to utilize it. The Pole? Why, he would make it his flagstaff, his hat rack—anything you please.

Now PEARY comes limping back in a crippled ship, with a resentful and disgusted crew. He tells us he has gone so many miles further than anybody else as to make a laughing stock of NANSEN and all the rest of them. We gather, moreover, that he intends to lecture later on at the usual rates, and that the vessel's wounds and dislocations are to be exhibited to a curious multitude like the Two Faced Lady and the Human Fly. Further along we may have it proved to us that PEARY'S "dash" has discovered some great scientific secrets of incalculable value to the human race. Further along, also, we may hear something of interest from the hired men of the party. In all respects at present visible, however, the country at large will perceive in this last expedition nothing that differs materially from its predecessors. Mr. PEARY may have advanced a little beyond the others, but that advance has been abandoned, and the next explorer will have it all to do over again.

Will Old Age Be Pensioned in England?

In view of declarations made last week by Sir HENRY CAMPBELL-BANNERMAN, the Prime Minister, and Mr. ASQUITH, Chancellor of the Exchequer, there seems to be no doubt that the Liberal Government is determined to drive an Old Age Pension bill through the House of Commons before dissolving the present Parliament. Replying to a deputation of members of the lower house, the Premier announced that the matter of old age pensions would be taken up as soon as time and money should permit. Inasmuch as objection on the score of a lack of funds would naturally be pressed most strongly by the Chancellor of the Exchequer, the same deputation regarded as peculiarly encouraging Mr. ASQUITH'S assurance that nothing was nearer his heart than the desire to submit a financial plan for such pensions. He added that the Ministry deemed the question one of extreme urgency.

There are moral and tactical reasons why the expediency of taking up the matter of pensions for superannuated workmen should commend itself to the Liberal Government at this time. To glance at the reasons in their order, it is evident that England cannot much longer afford to lag far behind Germany as regards consideration for that large section of the population which wears itself out in the service of capital. She cannot afford much longer to legislate on the egoistic principle taken for granted in the query: "Am I my brother's keeper?" Especially would an attitude of indifference be inopportune just now, when the remarkable results of BISMARCK'S pension legislation have been given to the world on the twenty-fifth anniversary of the formulation of his programme. The intention embodied in that programme was, it will be recalled, that the State should systematically assist working people by accident, illness and old age insurance.

Now it appears from the statistics published this month that no less a sum than $555,000,000 has been paid out in Germany during the last twenty years for illness; $232,000,000 for accidents, and $13,500,000 for old age. If the last amount seems comparatively small, we should bear in mind that the great majority of the workmen insured have not yet reached the age limit at which pensions begin. If from the total expenditure we turn to the number of beneficiaries, we find that since the pension acts became operative, two decades ago, no fewer than 60,000,000 persons have profited by BISMARCK'S legislation. Of course, the Socialists criticise these results, partly because in their opinion much more might be accomplished, and partly because they allege that by making any move at all in this direction the old Chancellor tried to steal their thunder. Unbiassed onlookers, on the other hand, recognize the tranquillizing service rendered to the nation by the pension legislation, and credit it with being the principal cause of the measure of contentment with which the working population of Germany bears the grievous burden of conscription.

In England recent events have made it plain to leaders of the old political parties that the working population must be reckoned with, and that if its discontent and restlessness are to be allayed they must take a leaf from BISMARCK'S book. Mr. JOSEPH CHAMBERLAIN awakened to the fact some years ago, and he is personally committed to old age pensions, while other conspicuous Unionists have said that they would not oppose pension legislation but for the strain to which they feared it would subject the imperial exchequer. It is, however, to the Liberals that the necessity of conciliating the working people of Great Britain by substantial and impressive concessions has been brought directly home by the unexpected and severe reverse which they encountered the other day at the municipal elections, not only in Greater London, but all over England. The reverse means that the Liberals must postpone a dissolution of Parliament until they can appeal to the electors on an issue more relevant and telling than the Education bill, which only the Protestant Nonconformists favor in its Government form.

An Old Age Pension bill would be more popular with the toiling masses of the British people than any other bill that could be framed. Especially would this be the case if Prime Minister BANNERMAN should carry out his expressed intention of proposing a law freed from the contributory feature of the Bismarckian scheme, to which German workmen have objected on account of the inquisitorial machinery involved.

Obviously, the establishment of old age pensions in Great Britain would give a notable impetus to the agitation for similar legislation in France and elsewhere.

State Power Over the Choice of Senators.

We observe that a question has arisen in New Jersey as to whether Governor STOKES can lawfully be chosen a Senator of the United States to succeed JOHN F. DRYDEN, whose term expires on March 4, 1907. It seems to be supposed by some persons that the Governor is ineligible for the United States Senate by reason of the following provision which is contained in the Constitution of the State of New Jersey:

"No member of Congress or person holding an office under the United States or this State shall exercise the office of Governor, and in case the Governor or person administering the government shall accept any office under the United States or the State, his office of Governor shall thereupon be vacant. Nor shall he be elected by the Legislature to any office under the Government of this State or of the United States during the term for which he shall have been elected Governor."

The view that any State can prescribe the qualifications of a member of the United States Senate is erroneous in law. Those qualifications are fixed by the Federal Constitution. In that instrument it is provided that the Senate of the United States "shall be composed of two Senators for each State, chosen by the Legislature thereof for six years; and each Senator shall have one vote." The Federal Constitution further provides as follows: "No person shall be a Senator who shall not have attained the age of thirty years and been nine years a citizen of the United States, and who shall not when elected be an inhabitant of that State for which he shall be chosen."

These provisions are exclusive, and no matter what any State may enact either in its Constitution or its statutes in regard to the eligibility of any person for the Senate it can have no effect to invalidate his title to the office, provided he possesses the qualifications specified in the Federal Constitution and is chosen by the Legislature of his State.

The Constitution of New York contains a provision which is even more rigorous in its terms than that which exists in New Jersey designed to prohibit the acceptance of civil appointments. It is in these words:

"No member of the Legislature shall receive any civil appointment within this State, or the Senate of the United States, from the Governor, the Governor and Senate, or from the Legislature, or from any city government, during the time for which he shall have been elected; and all such appointments and all votes given for any such member for any such office or appointment shall be void."

Notwithstanding the stringent language of this prohibition its inefficacy to prevent the election of a member of the Legislature to the Senate has repeatedly been recognized by lawyers, and it has been disregarded in the Legislature itself; notably in the case of JOHN C. JACOBS, who, while a State Senator from Kings county, received the vote of his party in the Legislature as a candidate for the Senate of the United States.

In this respect Senators of the United States stand in a different position from electors for President and Vice-President. The latter, under the Federal Constitution, are to be appointed by each State "in such manner as the Legislature thereof may direct." This provision leaves the Legislature at liberty to regulate the choice of electors in any manner it may see fit, and hence to impose such restrictions upon the method of appointment as may seem desirable. Thus the electors may be appointed by a popular vote of the whole State or by districts, or even by the Governor if the people of any State deem it wise to delegate to him the power of appointment.

As we have indicated, however, the States possess no power to restrict their Legislatures in the choice of Senators of the United States by requiring any qualifications for the office beyond those prescribed in the Federal Constitution.

It follows that if the Legislature of New Jersey really wants to send Governor STOKES to the Senate at Washington in place of JOHN F. DRYDEN there is no legal obstacle which can prevent it from doing so. Any assertion to the contrary is based upon ignorance of the law.

Reformed Modern Gypsies.

The reputation or want of reputation of the gypsies has been notorious for centuries. Much of their romantic charm, aside from their fortunate old habit of wandering, their curious lingos and their superstitions and tales, must be due to their supposed freedom from many humdrum restraints and moral and legal conventions. In the courts and the novels they have fared hardly; and their dangerous Egyptian wickedness has always roused and stirred the hair of respectability. An article by A. T. SINCLAIR, a Massachusetts lawyer, in the *Journal of American Folk-Lore* makes the dweller in gypsy tents with BORROW or GROOME or CHARLES GODFREY LELAND stare and gasp; and Sir WALTER SCOTT might find his conception of the incorrigible Bohemians profoundly modified by it.

In short, Mr. SINCLAIR'S gypsies are altogether better than they should be. He has spoken American gypsy for twenty-five years. He talks Hungarian gypsy. He has long studied the habits of Oriental gypsies. By training and observation he has made himself a competent witness on the subject. This is the man who shatters another innocent illusion. He admits that the gypsies are sharp witted. They have to be to keep alive in a world which has never been too indulgent. Travel and experience of life are their university. They keep their eyes and ears open. There are no shrewder fortune tellers or horse swappers. If they can hold their own in New England at horse trading, no other testimonial of their shrewdness is needed. Yet even in horse dealing they have found that honesty, or the reputation of it, pays. Many of these horse traders own real estate and are prosperous, and some of them are even laying up treasure in heaven:

"A good many of them are members of the Baptist Church and speak at the prayer meetings with all the fervor of the other members. Oftentimes I have heard them exhort visitors to their camps about the blessings and necessity of a Christian life."

It is Mr. SINCLAIR'S experience and belief that the gypsies "are not given to thieving more than other poor ignorant people and the community where they are found." The Governor-General of Russian Central Asia writes him that though they have the reputation of being thieves and cheats, "according to the reports of our administrative officials they behave themselves well." In America and Europe "the gypsy women are always chaste."

Do the gypsies steal children? Popular superstition and melodrama say Yes. Mr. SINCLAIR says No:

"All the gypsies in the vicinity of Boston know me as 'Lawyer' SINCLAIR, and for many years I have been consulted by them when in trouble. There have been a good many cases when children were lost and the gypsies were suspected of kidnapping them. Often their camps have been searched and they have been subjected to much annoyance and trouble. In no case, however, has it been found to be true that they had taken any children.

One case, I remember, excited great interest in the newspapers at the time it occurred. A WILLIS MCCORMICK disappeared in Boston, and his loss was heralded all over the country in large headlines by the newspapers. Finally two Russian gypsy girls were arrested in Washington, D. C., for stealing him. A piece of paper was found in the possession of one with the name of GERTRUDE, his sister, written on it. This was photographed and sent to her, and she asserted most positively it was her handwriting which she had written the evening he disappeared. A Boston detective was sent to Washington. The two girls were kept under arrest for many days and subjected to a rigid cross-examination, as was the whole gypsy camp. Finally it was discovered that these gypsies had never had or seen the boy. The popular superstition that gypsies steal children had excited so much the imaginations of the boy's relatives and the public that they all were deluded by foolish suspicions.

"The question has been one I have considered carefully for over twenty-five years, and I have made very many inquiries, but I have never even heard of a case where gypsies have ever stolen a single child. One good reason for discrediting any such belief was once expressed to me by a shrewd old gypsy woman: 'We have children enough of our own, more than we can take care of!'

"Again, they know there is the popular belief, and that they and their camps will be at once searched if a child is lost. They have often told me so, and say they are not such fools as to steal anything when 'the stolen property could be found on them.'"

Nor do they steal anything else. They know their reputation. They know that they would be suspected and searched. It saves trouble and money to be honest. "Here in America the gypsies boast that not one gypsy has ever been sent to jail"; and neither district attorneys nor policemen can contradict the boast.

"The moral standard of the gypsies," writes Mr. SINCLAIR, "must have vastly improved, if one-half that is written about them in books is true." The moral standard of the community has vastly improved, but were those tales true? Must it be admitted that the gypsies never were as bad as they were painted; that they were only a little browner and dirtier, but not a bit more criminal or immoral than the rest of us?

The Melanometer.

The latest reading of the delicate instrument which records the ups and downs of Mr. BLACK'S political philosophy is found in the following passage from his speech of Friday night at the Waldorf-Astoria:

"We magnify our men and minimize our party. When a cause seeks support because of its candidates and not because of its principles it is not far to the rocks. Men will change, but principles never, and if they are great enough to die for they are honorable enough to proclaim."

Principles, not men; the cause, not the candidate; magnify the organization and minimize the leader: such, we understand, are in substance the most recent outgivings of the political philosopher.

And yet it is only two years and a half since the Hon. FRANK S. BLACK was magnifying the man and minimizing the party, exalting the candidate above the principles, in a memorable speech in which he said among many other things of similar import:

"This is the time when great figures must be kept in front. If the pressure is great the material to resist it must be granite and iron. Interests so sacred should be trusted only to the care of those whose power, skill and courage have been tested and approved. There are times when great figures are hardly less than destiny, when the elements so come together that they select the agent they will use. Events sometimes select the strongest man, as lightning goes down the highest rod."

It is one of the professional duties—we cannot say one of the chiefest pleasures—of THE SUN to keep track of the varying political philosophy of the Hon. FRANK SWETT BLACK, whose ambition seems to be to establish himself as the political philosopher of the occasion.

When a Philadelphia gentleman of the name of GIBBONS, accompanied only by his bride, crossed the ocean on La Gascogne a few days ago in solitary possession of the first cabin, we were disposed to imagine that human heroism had reached its loftiest and finest manifestation. The bare thought of those twenty-two stewards of all classes, to say nothing of other servitors, all accustomed to "tips" of varying severity, lined up against GIBBONS and depending wholly upon him for their usual tribute—this thought filled us with wonder and consternation. We figured GIBBONS to ourselves spending those six fateful days under the unwinking observation of so vast a retinue of expectants, and it seemed to us that courage could take no bolder flight, that nerve could present no attitude more splendidly imperturbable.

But this, in the light of later and more astounding revelations, fades into pitiable insignificance. It now appears that GIBBONS, during his last days in Paris, exhibited such romantic, not to say reckless, intrepidity as to set the town agog and fairly paralyze the very fiercest boulevards. We learn that he made a practice of "facing all challenges to satisfy French honor"; that he even went to the length of acting as "second" in three French duels; finally, that having been summoned to the field of honor by "Count MAX BLOCH"—or was it "un Amiral Suisse?"—he appalled his very warmest laureates by choosing "revolvers at forty paces."

In the light of this announcement, which would be incredible if it were predicated upon any but a Philadelphia person, we easily explain to ourselves his unhesitating defiance of the twenty-two stewards of La Gascogne, and account for the ease with which he escaped from them in perfect health and with fortune unimpaired.

Perhaps Dr. NICHOLAS MURRAY BUTLER, president of Columbia University, has been misquoted in a statement attributed to him that football is steadily losing popularity in American universities. He also is reported as saying that at Princeton there is difficulty in getting out enough men to cheer the team, while at Yale and other universities there are other evidences that it is not so popular.

Here is some of the evidence of the waning popularity of the game: The day before the recent Yale-Princeton football game, almost the entire undergraduate body at Princeton waited in the rain for about fifteen minutes in order to attend the final practice of the team. Something like 30,000 persons saw the game. Last Thursday more than 32,000 tickets had been sold for the Harvard-Yale game. The football match between the Carlisle Indians and Minnesota drew 18,000 persons. The game between the University of Pennsylvania and Michigan drew 17,000 of those who have lost interest in the sport.

PRESIDENT ELIOT ON SPORT.

Declared to Have Been in Error in His Discussion of Athletic "Cleanliness."

TO THE EDITOR OF THE SUN—*Sir:* President Charles W. Eliot of Harvard University, in addressing the Harvard crew of 1906, said that rowing was a "clean and honorable" sport and that "there is only one other sport in college of which you can say that, and that is tennis."

President Eliot is one of the most scholarly men in this country and one whose opinion on any subject is rarely if ever expressed without careful consideration. I think, however, he is in error when he says that rowing and tennis are the only sports in college that are "clean and honorable." I have yet to see college baseball that isn't clean and honorable. I have yet to see college track games that aren't clean and honorable.

Ninety-nine per cent. of the football in which I have shared and which I have watched has been clean, and among teams of reputable colleges it has never in my experience been dishonorable in the sense that players maliciously violated the rules or tried to take an underhand advantage. Even in the days of the revolving wedges and mass formations, in straight and cross bucking, the play was generally clean, albeit as desperate physical encounter as could well be devised between barehanded men.

Rowing is a clean and honorable sport, but no more so than football. Rowing will try the last sinew and the last ounce of willingness in a man's body. But football means brawny opposition and personal contact; it means impact and collision between the adversaries. This alone surely cannot be dishonorable and unclean; a chance slugging match in the heat of contest, a violation of a prohibitive rule through the tremendous anxiety a sharp scrimmage develops, do not condemn the game as a dishonorable and unclean sport.

Without disparaging the Harvard idea of sport, frankly it seems to me that there is something ridiculous in President Eliot's declaration that outside of rowing tennis is the only clean and honorable college sport. Where I went to college we didn't consider tennis a college sport; we considered it a pastime. Football may, under any rules and any conditions, be rough, but I don't think there has ever been a time in its history when it wasn't as honorable as tennis, and between respectable teams almost as clean as tennis, except in the literal sense of the word.

NEW YORK, November 24. L. C.

The Reversal of the Old Law.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE SUN—*Sir:* Being a great admirer of President Roosevelt, his course regarding the colored soldiers dishonorably discharged from the army has grieved me beyond measure. The editorial in THE SUN of to-day is especially appropriate to the situation, and must meet the approval of all citizens of the republic who believe that a man is innocent until proved guilty.

It is impossible that the act of the President is to be sanctioned and approved by the American people. J. WARREN LAMB.

COOPERSTOWN, N. Y., November 23.

From the State's Name Book.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE SUN—*Sir:* THE SUN, which has noted gladly the fact that Joseph Henry Hrdlicka saved the community from dislocated maxillaries by changing his fearful surname to Henry and wondered why a court should permit a man named Sigmund Neuberger to call himself legally The Great Lafayette, will no doubt be gratified to read that John Comisky, defying popular sentiment and showing his desire for membership, by name at least, of a great family, has obtained leave to be hereafter known to fame and posterity as John Smith.

But the account was balanced about the same time by the action of Homer T. Smith in calling himself with judicial sanction Homer De Anguera. One is quite prepared to hear that a Sott was dissatisfied with his cognomen and removed what would be an unkind reflection on his habits and appetites from the minds of some people by the addition of a letter which now makes him a namesake of the author of "Waverley"; and we may read with languid interest how Thomas Long is now Gaitano Longo. We may even applaud the action of Mr. Wazannegger in becoming a Bowman, but we must be intensely curious to know what could have moved plain Charles Heisler to burden himself for the rest of his life and strain the memory of his acquaintances with the names Franz Joseph Carolus Häussler Van der Burgstall!

Some persons, we are sorry to see, are easily satisfied, and others do not regard their opportunities as duties. In proof of this we read that a gentleman named Kiwi was content with his name if the court would only permit him to take the additional Christian name of Emile—which the court did in the most obliging manner—and Mr. Michim Hirsheusohn availed himself of the law to no greater degree than to become Nathan Hirsh.

All these things are told to us in those delightfully "chatty" and entertaining books called the Laws of New York for 1906. TENTH NEW JERSEY.

NEW YORK, November 24.

Germany's Foreign Commerce.

The foreign commerce of Germany in 1904 and 1905 was as follows:

	Imports. Marks.	*Exports. Marks.*
1904	6,854,500,000	5,315,600,000
1905	7,436,300,000	5,841,800,000

Practically the export increase in 1905 equalled the import increase.

The chief sellers, by percentage, were:

	1904.	1905.
Great Britain	14.0	10.5
United States	13.8	13.5
Russia	11.9	14.7
Austria-Hungary	10.7	10.4

The chief buyers, by percentage, were:

	1904.	1905.
Great Britain	18.7	18.1
Austria-Hungary	11.0	10.2
United States	9.3	9.3
Netherlands	7.9	7.7
Switzerland	6.2	6.3
Russia	5.9	6.3

The "fixity" of American-German trade is noticeable.

Mice in Virginia Capitol.

From the Richmond Times-Dispatch.

Capitol mice have come into real prominence of late, and their movements are now the subject of much public interest. After destroying practically all the State seals in the office of the Secretary of the Commonwealth, the wise little creatures have discovered new and fruitful fields. They have invaded the sanctum of the Hon. Davis Bottom, Superintendent of Public Printing, and are now feeding upon the record books in his office.

These Capitol mice are foxy little creatures, and the situation has about resolved itself into a question of placing traps in all the Capitol offices, and it is believed such action will result in routing the entire breed.

Mouse trap venders are now vying with one another in praise of their respective wares in the hope of landing a big contract.

THE INSINUATIONS OF A FOREIGNER.

The other day a European who had been travelling in the West and was on the eve of sailing for home gave me some of his American impressions. His tour had lasted rather longer than the regulation three weeks required by law to entitle him to publish a book about us, but he intended to waive this right. In reproducing one or two of his remarks I shall be giving the public what it would otherwise lose.

"You have done an immense service to other nations in developing democracy to its extreme limits," he observed. "You have saved them the trouble of doing it for themselves. Your experiment proves among other things that democracy is bound to destroy itself, sooner or later. If you stopped foreign immigration, your population would begin dwindling to-morrow. The main result of democracy is evidently not the effacement of class distinctions, which are springing up among you with unparalleled rapidity, but the abolition of the old domestic hierarchy; in other words, the emancipation of the woman and the child. These are the two beings who have really gained liberty and equality under American conditions, and the consequence is the destruction of the home. The passing of your home life is generally recognized and deplored by yourselves, as I have found on all hands; but sometimes you wrongly ascribe it to such trifling concomitants as the difficulty of getting "help." The trouble lies elsewhere. The genuinely democratic wife and child are natural solvents of the home. I will not dwell on the disruptive traits of your women, with their passion for the club, the divorce court and other places of amusement; their readiness to assume grass weeds on tours abroad, and so on. The emancipated child is perhaps a still greater danger. His social character may be inferred from your anxiety to keep him out of existence. Hitherto you have hardly restricted European immigration, but the immigration of the American infant is being opposed pertinaciously. A waiter in Omaha—I quote at hazard from the numerous data I have collected on this point—told me that his wife and he were turning a stone deaf ear to President Roosevelt's sermons, simply because they felt unequal to the management of even one child of the prevailing type. An American poet prayed recently for some modification of this trouble:

"Before we train ogres the young to devour.

"I have been assured by several rich Americans who are rearing their families in Europe that the sole reason of their expatriation is fear of democracy on the hearth. In short, the pitiable birthrate among Americans, even in most favorable circumstances of vigor, abundance and elbow room, is due first and foremost to the democratic family. It is surprising that your President, especially as he is a Republican, should have overlooked the real cause of race suicide. The philosopher Vauvenargues wrote a century ago:

"If instead of dulling the vivacity of children, parents did their best to increase the vivacity and movement of their characters, what might we not expect from a fine, natural temper?

"Vauvenargues may have been a bachelor, but he was right in expecting a great deal. Democracy has done what he asked of parents, and the fine, natural temper answers every anticipation. The unerring repartee and relentless independence of the Democratic babe leave him without a rival in the nurseries of the world. It is a thousand pities that no domestic interior can be constructed capable of withstanding the pressure of his genius. If you are compelled to exclude him as an undesirable alien, the fault does not lie with this 'fine flower' of democracy, but with the fragility of human institutions.

"May I venture to say that the waiters in your restaurants and other public resorts are somewhat deliberate, as a rule, in taking and executing an order? This makes their subsequent celerity all the more amazing. When the meal has at last been served, they stand over one with heads cocked like terriers at a rat hole, and if you so much as lay down your knife and fork for an instant your plate has vanished. I was quite unable to get a square meal till I had acquired some practice in parrying these attacks. The most exhilarating feature of your young civilization as compared with the exhausted Old World is not its wealth—for, after all, no man and no people can spend more than a limited amount to any advantage—but its superabundant energy. 'Si jeunesse savait, si vieillesse pouvait!' Energy is the most difficult thing in the world to direct. I believe I am well within the limits of the facts in stating that many of your business men are so absorbed in piling up fortunes for their children that they have no time to make themselves acquainted with their names.

"Speaking of waiters reminds me of that very remarkable specialty, the American bill of fare. It is, of course, the largest in the world. Its copiousness is not even approached in the most celebrated restaurants on our side. I thought at first that the elaborate document, so rich in ingenious synonyms, was intended to distract the guest while waiting for the waiter. Afterward I discovered the true reason of it. On entering an American house I have seldom failed to perceive a huge dictionary spread open in a conspicuous position. In Boston I never failed to perceive one. Other observations confirm the idea that lexicography is one of the ruling passions of your nation, which was very naturally the originator of spelling reform. Hence, also, the multitudinous nomenclature of your bill of fare. These 'menus,' which are dictionaries in themselves, gratify your intellectual tastes even more than your appetites. Besides, there is a pretty touch of sentiment about them, as in that notice often hung up before humble restaurants: 'Like mother used to make it.' They must remind you, no doubt, of the vanished or vanishing home, with its swivel attachment and crowded page." W. A. G.

A Japanese View.

Referring to the San Francisco Japanese school troubles, Count Okuma, the eminent Japanese statesman, says in the *Sun Trade Journal* for November: "We are controlling our feeling of indignation simply for the reason that the United States has been the most friendly nation to us during the last fifty years, and therefore the self-controlling spirit of the Japanese prevents us from expressing our unpleasant sentiments. Again, I, as an individual, consider it as only a temporary disturbance, and I believe my nation will agree that, after all, the righteousness of the American people, as a whole, will render justice to us. In my opinion President Roosevelt and his Cabinet will surely render justice to us."

"Where Is Point au Basque?"

Senator Depew's speech at the Chamber of Commerce dinner.

Dear Chauncey, Point au Basque is where you are
Basking in sunlight of a nation's smiles,
The cupid Platts—both Thomas and John R.—
Are also there through lovely woman's wiles.

A man may smile and smile and yet may be—
A Senator, provoking loud guffaws
From the enraged electors forced to see
Two rattling puppets tinkering its laws.

So Point au Basque is where your laurel wreath
Basks in a nation's grin that's out of joint,
Whose curling lips are shielding hideous teeth;
So have a care, dear Chauncey. See the Point?

CHOLLAHC.

CHOICE OF A NEW MINISTER.

Objections to Some of the Candidates—The One Who Was Favored.

Kate Douglas Wiggin in Scribner's Magazine.

The faithful old parson had died after thirty years preaching, and perhaps the newer methods had begun to creep in, for it seemed impossible to suit the two communities most interested in the choice.

The Rev. Mr. Davis, for example, was a spirited preacher, but persisted in keeping two horses in the parsonage stable, and in exchanging them whenever he could get faster ones. As a parochial visitor he was incomparable, dashing from house to house with such speed that he could cover the parish in a single afternoon. This sporting tendency, which would never have been remarked in a British parson, was frowned upon in a New England village, and Deacon Milliken told Mr. Davis, when giving him what he alluded to as his "walking papers," that they didn't want the church run by hoss power!

The next candidate pleased Edgewood, where morning preaching was held, but the other parish, which had afternoon service, rejected him because he wore a wig—an ill matched, crookedly applied wig.

Number three was eloquent, but given to gesticulation, and Mrs. Jere Burbank, the president of the Dorcas society, who sat in a front pew, said she couldn't bear to see a preacher scramble 'round the pulpit hot Sundays.

Number four, a genial, handsome man, gifted in prayer, was found to be a Democrat. The congregation was overwhelmingly Republican in its politics, and perceived something ludicrous, if not positively blasphemous, in a Democrat preaching the Gospel. ("Ananias and Beelzebub "ll be candidates here, first thing we know!" exclaimed the outraged Republican nominee for District Attorney.)

Number five had a feeble minded child, which the hiring committee prophesied would stand in the parsonage front yard making talk for the other denominations.

Number six was the Rev. Judson Baxter, the present incumbent, and he was voted to be as near perfection as a minister can be in this finite world. His young wife had a small income of her own, so the subscription committee hoped that they might not be eternally driving over the country to get somebody's 50 cents that had been overdue for eight months, but might take their onerous duties a little more easily.

PAROCHIAL SCHOOLS.

Will They Finally Compel Religious Instruction in the Public Schools?

TO THE EDITOR OF THE SUN—*Sir:* The experience of Raisuli, who has reached office by being "against the organization" until he compelled it to make terms with him; the recent election here, in which Hearst was against Murphy until he compelled that sagacious man to adopt him; and some other but less conspicuous cases in which the same plan was adopted by some "outs" in order to compel the "ins" to let them also "in," impel me to draw attention to another case wherein a resolute and long continued attitude of aloofness has been maintained. I refer to the school situation in this city.

No one can travel to any extent without observing a school in close proximity to every Catholic church, or nearly every one, in this city. I think there are nearly a hundred, each with from a few hundred up to 1,500 or 1,800 pupils. Rumor affirms with considerable emphasis that in these schools the secular education imparted is fully equal to that imparted by their great rivals, the public schools; those who actually conduct them and who are in an especial manner charged with their defence point with pride to many examinations for admission to the civil, military and naval services, where the graduates of these schools have come out equal or superior to others.

The sentiment which began and maintains these schools, although it necessitates a double school tax, is in no sense hostile to the public schools; if it was I would refrain from commending it. It merely assumes that no education is complete which leaves out the religious element. Vague and shadowy ethics based on the writings of a variety of sages from Confucius to Rousseau, with an occasional veiled reference to Christ, and that mostly in hymns more or less distorted, have no charms for the independent minded citizens who pin their faith on these schools. I have even noticed statements of late in the press to the effect that any person, whether Catholic or not, will be permitted to send his children to these schools; I suppose, however, not to the exclusion of any Catholic child, and also on condition of paying in one way or another, as regular patrons do.

As an observer of school events, and merely as one asking a question, will our public school system eventually find it necessary to adopt these schools, preserving their autonomy and respecting their basic peculiarity? And if so, on what ground can the public authorities violate the alleged American principle of non-sectarian schools? I say alleged, since the schools in the beginning were rampantly religious. Perhaps it will be on the ground that since this parochial school system has actually come to be, and since it may be assumed to be more or less handicapped by lack of funds, therefore a *fait accompli* may gracefully be recognized and a school curriculum which has been enriched by many subjects which, rightly or wrongly, are called fads and frills by many who cannot be suspected of hostility to the public school system may yet prove elastic enough to become public in fact as in name by not excluding all who would wish to put catechism and religion on a level with drawing and nature study. And this is written by one who must necessarily be friendly with the public school system, and who is so. ROBERT P. GREEN.

Public School 5.

NEW YORK, November 24.

Japan and the American Cotton Trade.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE SUN—*Sir:* A correspondent in THE SUN of November 13 lays particular stress upon the hypothesis that our cotton trade will greatly suffer as the result of Japanese children being sent to separate public schools at San Francisco.

It may be well to remember that Japan, long before her war was over, had the project in view of utilizing Manchuria's fields for the cultivation of cotton. It was maintained that this Japanese industry set on foot on Manchurian soil would bring about a tariff regulation between China and Japan by which it would be made possible to spin Manchurian cotton in Japanese factories at home, and the manufactured goods thence shipped to China would be made exempt of duties. This would baffle outside competition as well as be the means of securing to Japan the entire cotton trade along the littoral extending from Vladivostok to Singapore. Needless to add, the cotton fields in Manchuria would be a Japanese monopoly.

This is the inclination of the Japanese mind. If the United States loses her cotton trade in the Eastern Hemisphere it will be for reasons having nothing whatever to do with Japanese friendship or hostility to the United States. C. T. C.

PASSAIC, N. J., November 23.

Foreigners in China.

From Daily Consular and Trade Reports.

The foreign population of China in 1906 is estimated by Consul-General Thomas Sammons of Newchwang at 46,000. This includes 6,454 at Hong Kong (British territory), 1,432 at Tsingtau or Kiauchow (German), and 7,808 at Newchwang, but does not include the balance of Manchuria nor Mongolia. By figuring 20,000 to 30,000 Japanese, aside from railway guards, in southern Manchuria, and as many Russians in the north and Mongolia, the grand total would be more than 100,000 foreigners. It is estimated that less than 8,000,000 Chinese are living outside of their native land, 75 per cent. of whom are accounted for in Formosa, Siam and the Malay Peninsula.

When Boston Is Locked Up.

From the Boston Herald.

Secretary of War William H. Taft has not a very high opinion of Boston as a place to have a good time in, judging from his answer to an invitation extended by John J. Cadogan, the real estate man, when the effort was being made to arrange for the nation's taking over part of Deer Island.

"Come down to Boston, "suggested Mr. Cadogan, "and we'll take you down the harbor, give you some good fishing and a good dinner, take in a theatre and——"

"Then put me to bed," continued the Secretary, laughing. "I understand you lock the town up at 11 o'clock."

Explanation From Historian Posey Wilson.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE SUN—*Sir:* In my account of Jefferson Davis's early romance, printed in THE SUN November 12, I am made to say that Capt. Hitchcock was the officer who brought Col. Fremont from California under arrest. I meant to say Capt. Mason, by this time a Colonel (or so), Mason is the officer who challenged Mr. Davis at Fort Crawford, but the challenge was ignored and the affair ended. POSEY S. WILSON.

DENVER, November 16.